Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that a substance deficient in butterfat and containing excessive moisture had been mixed and packed with and substituted in whole or in part for butter, which the said article purported to be. Adulteration was alleged for the further reason that a valuable constituent of the article, butterfat, had been in whole or in part abstracted.

On August 7, 1923, the Minnesota Cooperative Creameries Assoc., Inc., claimant, having admitted the allegations of the libel and consented to the entry of a decree, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be released to the claimant upon payment of the costs of the proceedings and the execution of a bond in the sum of \$1,872, in conformity with section 10 of the act, conditioned in part that it be shipped to the factory and reworked and reprocessed under the supervision of this department.

Howard M. Gore, Acting Secretary of Agriculture.

11827. Adulteration of butter. U. S. v. 37 Tubs and 64 Tubs of Butter. Consent decrees of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond. (F. & D. No. 17642. I. S. No. 374-v. S. No. F.-441.)

On July 13, 1923, the United States attorney for the Southern District of New York, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel praying the seizure and condemnation of 101 tubs of butter, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at New York, N. Y., consigned by the Minnesota Cooperative Creameries Assoc., Inc., No. 7, Brooten, Minn., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about June 18, 1923, and transported in interstate commerce into the State of New York, and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that a substance deficient in butterfat and containing excessive moisture had been mixed and packed with and substituted in whole or in part for the said article. Adulteration was alleged for the further reason that a valuable constituent of the article, butterfat, had been in whole or in part abstracted.

On August 7, 1923, the Minnesota Cooperative Creameries Assoc., Inc., claimant, having admitted the allegations of the libel and consented to the entry of decrees, judgments of condemnation and forfeiture were entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be released to the said claimant upon payment of the costs of the proceedings and the execution of bonds in the aggregate sum of \$3,960, in conformity with section 10 of the act, conditioned in part that it be shipped to the factory to be reworked and reprocessed under the supervision of this department.

HOWARD M. GORE, Acting Secretary of Agriculture.

11828. Adulteration of butter. U. S. v. 64 Tubs of Butter. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond to be reprocessed. (F. & D. No. 17653. I. S. No. 505-v. S. No. E-4450.)

On July 16, 1923, the United States attorney for the Southern District of New York, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel praying the seizure and condemnation of 64 tubs of butter, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at New York, N. Y., alleging that the article had been shipped by the American Creamery Assoc., from Copas, Minn., on or about June 26, 1923, and transported from the State of Minnesota into the State of New York, and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that a product deficient in milk fat and high in moisture had been mixed and packed with and substituted in whole or in part for the said article. Adulteration was alleged for the further reason that a valuable constituent of the article, butterfat, had been in whole or in part abstracted.

On August 7, 1923, the Minnesota Cooperative Creameries Assoc., Inc., claimant, having admitted the allegations of the libel and consented to the entry of a decree, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be released to the said claimant upon payment of the costs of the proceedings and the execution of a bond in the sum of \$1,536, in conformity with section 10 of the act, conditioned in part that it be delivered to the factory to be reworked and reprocessed to the satisfaction of this department.